



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

INSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF VIRGINIA IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY. By Philip Alexander Bruce. Two volumes. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London.

I congratulate Dr. Bruce upon the completion and publication of his splendid works upon Virginia in the seventeenth century. Having in his *Economic*, and *Social* histories of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century—the one published in 1896 and the other in 1907—described in detail two sides of colonial life in that age, it only remained to issue an *Institutional* history of the same period, in order to present a complete picture of all the conditions prevailing in Virginia previous to 1700. This Dr. Bruce has now done, with a great and admirable display of erudition and hard work, which entitles him to enthusiastic praise as a scholar and thinker. As there is no other person in Virginia so fit for the task, one cannot but wish that Dr. Bruce would devote his future labors to an authoritative history of Virginia, which would take in the three centuries of our political life. Yet studies on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries like to those which he has completed for the seventeenth, would enable the historian to plant his work upon a foundation deep and strong. If we could be assured that Dr. Bruce would have successors who would carry out his methods with respect to the next two centuries, we might afford to wait awhile to get access to the material made available in such copious supply. Dr. Bruce's treatment of Virginia conditions is luminous and so generally correct that it seems hypercritical to point out any defects. Amid so many persons used in illustration, it is not at all strange that he should sometimes spell their names wrongly. Vol. I., p. 84, Alexander Dornphin should be Alexander Doniphan; p. 512, Robert Tyler should be Robert Taylor, &c. Probably the most serious mistake in this way is the reference made to "Rev. William Semple," who is said to have represented the Bishop of London previous to Dr. James Blair. This name should be Rev. Peter Temple, who was minister of York Parish in York county. The subject of Education is well handled by Dr. Bruce, but I think that he probably concedes too much to education in New England. Town life gave greater facilities, it is true, but two causes counteracted the favor of the law, and the political conditions in that community. One was the poverty of the soil, and the other was the isolation of the New Englanders, both in religion and thought, which cut them off from the culture of the Mother Country. Instead of having a constant supply as Virginia had of ministers from Oxford and Cambridge to teach the youth, their supply during the seventeenth century was home-made, the best coming from Harvard, which until the first quarter of the eighteenth century was not much more than a grammar school. The result was that the masses were woefully illiterate.

As an interesting proof that the custom of sending young men from Virginia to England for education began at a very early date in the sev-

enteenth century, the authority of the London Company in 1621 might have been cited by Dr. Bruce. At a meeting of the committee of the Company, it was alleged as one of the reasons why the East India Free School should be erected that "the Planters have been hitherto constrained to their great costs to send their children from thence hither to be taught."

Probably Dr. Bruce is inclined to give a little too aristocratic turn to society in Virginia, which the records of the seventeenth century do not bear him out in. While social differences were undoubtedly prevalent, the lack of any great English nobles in Virginia and the independent and scattered mode of existence made it impossible to keep up the differences of the Mother Country to any great extent. One strong evidence of a comparative equality is shown in the existence of universal suffrage, which practically prevailed in Virginia till 1736. For though in the latter part of the seventeenth century a freehold qualification was prescribed, there was no limit attached to the freehold, and Spotswood tells us, in 1713, that any one owning *half an acre* of land could vote and hold a seat in the Assembly. As land was very cheap, a half acre amounted to no limitation whatever.

AMERICAN HISTORY FOR USE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS. By Roscoe Lewis Ashley. The MacMillan Company, London. 1909.

The tone and temper of this work are to be highly recommended, despite its faults. These faults arise from Mr. Ashley's too great dependence upon secondary authority and his prejudices as a Northern man and evidently a man of strong nationalistic views. Some errors suggestive of a hundred like them may be noted:

1. The responsibility of the spoils system is credited to Jackson, when it is well known that it began with John Adams, who filled every office with Federalists, and after his defeat in 1800, tried to perpetuate the Federal rule by the Midnight Judges and depriving Jefferson of the presidency.

2. On page 312 Harrison "made clear his preference for a national bank." I challenge Mr. Ashley to produce any evidence for this assertion.

3. On page 313 the account of John Tyler, while fairer than usual, is still unjust. Mr. Ashley cites Macmaster, but has Mr. Ashley ever read "The Letters and Times of the Tylers," by Lyon G. Tyler?

4. On the question of secession it is not to be expected that Mr. Ashley would tell the whole truth, but after stating on page 378 that the South and North were two distinct people, he should have gone further and said the South as such was entitled to its independence and that the war waged by the North was a cruel and unjust one.